

*PLOS ONE* Appeal Request Form

Please fill out the below form with the relevant information. We require a response to all three sections before we can evaluate your appeal request.

---

1. Academic Editor

Our standard process is to consult Academic Editors on appeals on decisions they handled. If you have any concerns that a consultation with the Academic Editor may unduly affect the evaluation of your appeal, please indicate so along with a brief summary of the reasons for your concerns.

☐ I do not have any concerns about the Academic Editor being consulted on this appeal.

☒ I do have concerns that the Academic Editor being consulted may unduly affect the evaluation of my appeal for the following reasons:

The Academic Editor (Dr. Juan Añel) himself provided the review.

Dr. Añel's professional work will be seriously and negatively affected by publication of this manuscript, which demonstrates that climate models have no predictive value.

From PLoS itself: "The PLoS policy also requires that individual editors recuse themselves from deliberations about papers authored by friends, colleagues, or adversaries."

Following from the negative impact, Dr. Añel might well fall under the category of "adversary," and should likely have recused himself.

However, I leave this judgement to the PLoS Editorial Board, or to chief editor Dr. Heber.

Nevertheless, it is difficult to believe Dr. Añel will be unbiased concerning an appeal about the very review he himself wrote.

Additionally, Dr. Añel expressed an unjustified personal umbrage about the author's objectively documented observation concerning the expertise of climate modelers in physical error analysis (please see author response items 1.4.1 and 1.4.2).

This grievance is unlikely to foster dispassionate judgment.

## 2. Editorial Policies

If you have concerns that the decision deviates from one of our editorial policies, please provide us with some brief notes on the specific policy.

☐ I do not have any concerns about this decision deviating from PLOS ONE's editorial policies.

☒ I do have concerns that this decision deviated from PLOS ONE's editorial policies for the following reasons:

Dr. Añel's position as Editorial reviewer of the manuscript would seem to violate the expressed PLoS policies regarding an adversarial relationship, as documented below:

PLoS Medicine Editors (2008) "*Making Sense of Non-Financial Competing Interests*"  
PLoS Medicine 5(9), 1299-1301

"Editors are by no means above these standards of best practice. ... **The PLoS policy also requires that individual editors recuse themselves from deliberations about papers authored by friends, colleagues, or adversaries** [8]. ... Luborsky and colleagues found that a researcher's allegiance to a given school of thought exerted a bias on the study design and outcomes of psychotherapy research comparable to that which has been documented for financial interests. (author bold)"

Dr. Añel may well take an adversarial view of a study that negatively impacts his own professional work.

PLoS Medicine Editors (2005) "*How Does PLoS Medicine Manage Competing Interests?*" PLoS Medicine 2(3) 171-172

"Should editors declare their own competing interests? We think so (and have declared ours at [http://medicine.plosjournals.org/perlerv/?request=getstatic&name=editors\\_interests](http://medicine.plosjournals.org/perlerv/?request=getstatic&name=editors_interests))."

Dr. Añel apparently did not declare his competing interest.

<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/reviewer-guidelines>  
Competing Interests: "You are a direct competitor."

Dr. Añel does have a directly competitive relationship with the manuscript study. However, it seems likely he did not declare his competing professional interest when he accepted the Editorial assignment.

<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/s/competing-interests>

### **Non-financial competing interests**

"Personal convictions (political, religious, ideological, or other) related to a paper's topic that might interfere with an unbiased publication process (at the stage of authorship, peer review, editorial decision-making, or publication)"

Dr. Añel's professional work certainly implies and likely entrains a negative personal conviction in opposition to the topic of the manuscript.

3. Response to Reviewers:

Please provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers and any Academic Editor's comments in a separate document.

☒ I confirm that I have attached a Response to Reviewers as a separate file to this email in addition to this form.

(Author NB: Only Editor Dr. Añel provided a review. There were no further attachments.)